

Pakshirajan LAKSHMINARASIMHAN^a, Chidambaram MURUGAN^b, Kanjiraparambil A. SUJANA^b and Kanchi N. GANDHI^{c,*}: **A Report on the Third Botanical Nomenclature Course Organized by The Botanical Survey of India at Coimbatore**

^aBotanical Survey of India, Western Regional Centre, Pune, Maharashtra, 411001 INDIA;

^bBotanical Survey of India, Southern Regional Centre, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, 641003 INDIA;

^cHarvard University Herbaria, 22 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138 U.S.A.

*Corresponding author: gandhi@oeb.harvard.edu

(Accepted on May 7, 2019)

The Botanical Survey of India (BSI) held its third Botanical Nomenclature Course on 11–15 March 2019 at the Institute of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding (IFGTB). The course drew 99 participants from across the country, including 55 from outside BSI. Er. A. K. Pathak (Director Incharge of the BSI) was Convener of the course; Lakshminarasimhan and Murugan served as Coordinator and Facilitator, respectively. Gandhi served as the Director and taught the course on the 2018 International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (“Shenzhen Code”).

Prior to the start of the course, there was an Inaugural Function, anchored by Sujana. Dr. Mohit Gera (IFS Director, IFGTB) was the chief guest, and Dr. M. Sanjappa (ex-Director, BSI), Dr. N. P. Balakrishnan (ex-Joint Director, BSI), Dr. Y. Thulajappa (retired Professor and Head of Department of Botany, The National College, Bengaluru), and Mrs. Rajalakshmi Prasad (Gandhi’s biographer and former student) were guests of honor.

After the chief guest’s speech and remarks from the guests of honor, Gandhi began the course with a historical review of botanical nomenclature from before Linnaeus to the Shenzhen Code. He then provided a detailed description of the Shenzhen Code, with special emphasis on validity of publication and solving nomenclatural problems of the participants. Various sessions reviewed the physical structure of the Code: preamble, ranks, and names of taxa

(Articles 1–5 and 16–28 of the Shenzhen Code); status, typification, starting points, conservation, and sanctioning (Articles 6–15); effective publication; validity of names, part I (Articles 29–39); validity of names, part II (Articles 40–45); authorship citation (Articles 46–50); rejection of names, I (Articles 51–59); and orthography (Articles 60–62). Gandhi also reviewed hybrid names and fungal code. Each day ended with a 1-hour discussion session with participants.

Gandhi’s discussion included two examples showing how English grammar could affect validity of a plant name, e.g., Haworth (Rev. Pl. Succ.: 82. 1821) validly published the name *Mesembryanthemum* sect. *Minima* Haw. and remarked that “If this section proves to be a genus, the name of *Conophyton* would be apt”. The designation “*Conophyton*”, suggested by Haworth was not a validly published generic name because Haworth did not adopt or accept the genus (see Art. 36.1 Ex. 4). In contrast to the preceding situation, Gandhi provided a different example, viz., *Crepis sancta* (L.) Bornm. (in Mitth. Thüring. Bot. Vereins 30: 79. 1913). On his new combination, Bornmüller remarked that “If one unites the genus *Lagoseris* with *Crepis*, as Muschler has done recently, the plant has to be named *Crepis sancta*.” Gandhi mentioned that he and Dr. John Wiersema (the Chief Editor of the Code Appendices II–VIII) discussed the validity of the name *C. sancta* and asserted that it is a validly published species name. Gandhi elaborated stating that in the first example

(*Conophyton*), the verb in the second part of the sentence (“would be apt”) is the simple future resulting in a conditional sentence and thus causing invalidity, whereas in the second example (*Crepis*), the tense in both parts of the sentence (“unites” and “has to be”) is the simple present resulting in a zero-conditional sentence in which one can replace “if” with “when”, because both express general truths. Wiersema asserted that the meaning would be unchanged as shown here: “When (= “If”) one unites the genus *Lagoseris* with *Crepis*, as Muschler has done recently, the plant has to be named *Crepis sancta*.”

At the interactive discussion session, several

participants discussed nomenclatural problems they encountered, e.g., Ms. Ruma Bhadra (Fig. 1C) mentioned the derivation of the name trib. *Moreae* Britton & Rose (1930) from *Mora* Benth. 1839 (genitive form: *morae*) and the name trib. *Moreae* Dumort. (1829) from *Morus* L. 1753 (genitive form: *mori*). Gandhi remarked that the concept of illegitimacy due to homonymy does not apply to infrafamilial names and that the later homonym trib. *Moreae* Britton & Rose is legitimate (vide Art. 53.1 Ex. 5).

At the end of the course, all the course participants were given certificates. Sujana proposed a vote of thanks.



Fig. 1. A. Delegates of the Course. B. Dr. Gandhi interacting with audience. C. Solving of a nomenclature problem by a participant.

P. Lakshminarasimhan^a, C. Murugan^b, K. A. Sujana^b, K. N. Gandhi^c : 第3回インド植物命名規約の研修会

インドでは国際藻類・菌類・植物命名規約の周知を図り Botanical Survey of India (BSI) が中心となって研修会を開いている。この会は2013年のメルボルン規約研修会 (Gandhi 2013) に始まり、今回は2019年3月にCoimbatoreで第3回が開かれ、Shenzhen Code 深圳規約について学習した。参加者は99人であった (Fig. 1), Dr. Gandhi が規約を解説し、特に正式な学名発表の条件

を詳しく講義した。また、参加者が持ち寄った命名上の問題を説明して解決した (Fig. 1).

^aインド・Western Regional Centre, Botanical Survey of India,

^bインド・Southern Regional Centre, Botanical Survey of India,

^c米国・Harvard University Herbaria)